



### 3.10 CULTURAL RESOURCES

3.10 CULTURAL RESOURCES .....	3-201
3.10.1 Introduction .....	3-201
3.10.2 Affected Environment .....	3-201
3.10.3 Environmental Effects .....	3-203
3.10.3.1 Alternative 1 .....	3-203
3.10.3.2 Alternative 2 .....	3-204
3.10.3.3 Alternative 3 .....	3-205

#### 3.10.1 Introduction

Cultural resources are archaeological and historic sites and artifacts and traditional religious, ceremonial and social uses and activities of affected Indian tribes (WAC 222-16-010) (see Glossary for other related definitions). Affected Indian tribes are federally recognized tribes that request in writing from DNR, information on forest practices applications and notification filed on specific areas. Cultural resources are important to our understanding of culture, history, heritage, and relationships to the land. One measure of significance for cultural resources is listing or eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

DNR and the Washington forest practices rules aim to protect cultural resources from impacts of timber harvesting and related activities on private and state lands. The Washington Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (OAHP) is the state's link in the National Historic Preservation Program, and works closely with federal and state agencies, tribal nations, local governments, businesses, and individuals to meet both federal and state responsibilities for cultural resource protection. OAHP maintains the Washington State Inventory of Cultural Resources.

#### 3.10.2 Affected Environment

A discussion of the prehistory, history, and ethnography for the entire state of Washington is necessarily broad and simplified. Site-specific prehistoric, historic, and ethnographic overviews may be developed for specific forest practices.

Evidence for prehistoric human occupation of Washington state extends back at least 12,000 years, and is found at sites throughout the state. General trends in prehistoric settlement and subsistence have been constructed from these sites. From 12,000 to 8,000 years ago, the climate throughout Washington was much cooler and wetter than it is presently. Occupants of this area during this period had a subsistence strategy that was based primarily on hunting of large mammals, and collection of fish, shellfish, plants, and other resources. The climate shifted and a warmer and drier period ensued, eventually reaching conditions similar to the present about 4,500 years ago. Subsistence and settlement patterns adapted to the changes in climate and resource availability. By 3,000 years ago, and up to the time of European contact (the historic or ethnographic period), the area was characterized by large semi-permanent winter villages, seasonal forays to the



## Chapter 3

---

uplands and occupation of seasonal camps, fully developed food processing and storage technologies, and complex trade and travel networks from the Pacific Coast to the Columbia Plateau.

Ethnographic records paint a picture of the lifestyles of people who occupied Washington before Europeans arrived. Physical barriers, such as mountain ranges and rivers, defined tribal territories and resulted in unique adaptations to varied environmental conditions. However, the social organization of Indian groups was probably considerably more complex and fluid than indicated by present-day tribal designations. While some of the recognized tribes in Washington are similar to their aboriginal composition, others are confederations of bands and tribes created in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century in conjunction with the making of treaties with the U.S. Government, or in the 20<sup>th</sup> century for government administration. Ethnographic records indicate that Indian groups came together at certain times of the year to hunt, fish, and gather specific types of resources or participate in social and ceremonial gatherings, and then dispersed. Exogamy, marriage outside of the kinship group, was practiced widely, creating complex social networks with kin ties beyond the village, and facilitating trade and travel.

Western Washington was a relatively lush world, with abundant riverine and marine resources. Among the western Washington Indians, salmon was a major source of food and the focus of ceremonial and social life. Wood was used to construct canoes and houses, including large communal longhouses, and cedar bark and other plants were used to make clothing, baskets, and other objects. The seasonal subsistence pattern for many of these groups involved gathering at villages in the lower river valleys during the winter and moving in dispersed groups to take advantage of seasonally available upland animal and plant resources during the rest of the year. The most basic social unit was the extended family, which stayed together during seasonal migrations to resource procurement areas. A unique feature of some coastal Indian cultures was the potlatch, a grand feast at which the host earned prestige and political power by giving away their possessions to the guests.

Eastern Washington was characterized by a more arid climate and more sparsely scattered resources. People living on the Columbia Plateau also relied upon salmon as a major food source, supplementing this with rabbit, deer, and elk, as well as roots, berries, and nuts, and following a seasonal subsistence cycle. The basic social unit of the Plateau Indians was the highly mobile band, which was well adapted to hunting, fishing, and gathering more widely dispersed resources. Shelters were built from poles and animal skins or woven mats, or pithouses were dug partially below ground. Caves and natural rock shelters also provided protection from the elements. Sweathouses played an important part in Plateau culture and were used in purification rituals. Europeans introduced the horse in the late 1700s, profoundly altering the economic and social organization of these groups by facilitating travel and trade over much greater distances.

Arrival of Europeans, beginning in the late 18<sup>th</sup> century, significantly disrupted the health, social organization, and culture of the Indians who occupied the area as well as the natural resources of the area. The earliest European explorations of Washington were by fur trappers and traders. The Hudson's Bay Company, other trading companies, and the U.S.



Government established forts throughout Washington (hostilities between Europeans and Indians peaked in the 1850s and 1860s with the so-called Indian Wars). In the mid-1800s, the U.S. Government made a number of treaties with the Washington Indians. In the treaties, Indians ceded title to their lands in exchange for certain reserved rights and protections, and opened the land to settlement. The federal government also sponsored several expeditions to explore transportation routes between eastern and western Washington. In 1887, the completion of the transcontinental Northern Pacific Railroad through the Cascades opened the new State of Washington for trade to the east. Timber companies, ranchers, and farmers now had a faster, cheaper way of getting their products to markets in the east. Work on the railroads attracted large numbers of Europeans and Asians, and the booming logging, milling, and agricultural industries attracted thousands more. Discoveries of gold and coal in the Cascades in the mid to late-1800s and additional gold and silver finds to the east in Idaho territory contributed to the growth in the economy and population of Washington. Large-scale irrigation, reservoir, and hydroelectric projects were developed, particularly east of the Cascades, beginning around the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

Settlement and development have altered or destroyed numerous cultural resources of Washington (including cultural resources on forest lands). Passage of cultural resource protection laws has led to improved identification and management of these resources in recent years. Although the locations of many sites with archaeological or historic value are now known, many sites are unknown and are still sometimes altered or destroyed by actions associated with development or resource extraction.

### 3.10.3 Environmental Effects

#### 3.10.3.1 Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, protection of cultural resources is afforded through the forest practices application process; little incidental protection of undiscovered resources is provided in RMZs and WMZs.

Although there is no requirement to conduct systematic cultural resource surveys on forest lands under the existing forest practices rules associated with Alternative 1, these rules do protect previously recorded cultural resources in several ways. A Class IV-Special or Class III application must be filed with DNR for forest practices on lands containing cultural resources. DNR notifies affected Indian tribes of all applications of concern to the tribes, including those involving cultural resources identified by the tribes. DNR provides OAHP with copies of all applications and notifications for forest practices to be conducted on lands known to contain historic or archaeological resources. In addition, DNR may consult with OAHP (and tribes) on the significance of cultural resources within a project area. Affected Indian tribes may forward plans for protection of cultural resources to the OAHP, but OAHP is not generally called into meetings with landowners.

A Class IV-Special application for forest practices must be filed with DNR for forest practices on lands containing archaeological or historic sites registered with OAHP, or containing sites with evidence of Native American cairns, graves, or glyptic records, as provided for in chapters 27.44 and 27.53 RCW. The DNR consults with affected Indian tribes to help identify such sites. Class IV-Special applications must include an environmental checklist in compliance with SEPA. DNR may require additional information or a detailed environmental statement. Under SEPA authority, DNR can then



## Chapter 3

---

deny the Class IV-special application, accept the application unconditionally, or condition the application with mitigation measures to protect cultural resources.

According to the FPRs, a Class III application must be filed with DNR for forest practices on lands containing cultural resources which are listed on or are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, or have been identified to the DNR as being of interest to an affected Indian tribe. In practice, however, National Register-eligible or – listed sites are automatically registered with OAHP; therefore, the presence of such sites automatically triggers a Class IV-Special application, rather than a Class III.

Under a Class III application, the landowner meets with the affected tribes with the objective of agreeing on a plan for protecting the archaeological and cultural values of the resource. If the landowner and affected Indian tribes come to an agreement, then the landowner may voluntarily add the mitigation measures to the application for cultural resources protection. In this case, then the DNR will enforce the terms of the permit. If an agreement regarding mitigation measures is not reached, or if there is no landowner, the provisions protecting cultural resources under 27.44 and 27.53 RCW still apply, but the DNR has no authority to enforce these provisions.

Protection identified for riparian areas, wetlands, and unstable slopes under Alternative 1 also provides incidental protection to undiscovered historic and archaeological sites by limiting or excluding forest practices in these areas. The amount of protection to these areas is addressed in Section 3.4.

Under Alternative 2, protection of cultural resources is afforded through the forest practices application process. In addition, a cultural resource module is added to watershed analysis and substantial incidental protection of undiscovered resources is provided in RMZs and WMZs.

### 3.10.3.2 Alternative 2

Alternative 2 would include the same regulatory protections for cultural resources that are provided under Alternative 1, and would provide additional protection. Alternative 2 would add a cultural resource module to the state watershed analysis process, to take effect within 2 years, which would make it more likely that cultural resources would be identified and considered in watershed analysis and planning. DNR would ultimately be responsible for conducting the analysis of watersheds, but individual landowners may opt to conduct their own analyses to speed the environmental review process.

In addition, Alternative 2 would require much larger RMZs and more protection of land with unstable slopes compared to Alternative 1 (see Figures 3.4-7 and 3.4-8). This could provide additional incidental protection to certain types of undiscovered cultural resources (e.g., archaeological sites) along streams. Most of the larger RMZs are located along Type S and F streams and rivers (large and medium-sized streams and rivers that contain salmon and other fish populations). Protection of wetlands and adjacent areas would be at a level similar to that provided under Alternative 1.



Under Alternative 3, cultural resource protection would be virtually the same as under Alternative 2, except for greater incidental protection due to wider RMZs and WMZs and specific protection of culturally important plants in the riparian zones during pesticide applications.

### 3.10.3.3 Alternative 3

Alternative 3 would include the same regulatory protections for cultural resources provided under Alternatives 1 and 2, but the buffer widths in RMZs would be larger than those provided under Alternative 2, and Alternative 3 has the potential, therefore, to provide greater incidental protection to undiscovered cultural resources over a larger area along streams (see Figures 3.4-7 and 3.4-8). Like Alternative 2, Alternative 3 would incorporate a cultural resource module in watershed analysis planning. Alternative 3 also provides for the protection of culturally significant plants from pesticide applications, an additional protection that is not included under Alternatives 1 or 2.



## ***Chapter 3***

---

This page intentionally left blank